



## REDMOND PARK BOARD

### **Meeting Minutes March 3, 2005 Old Redmond SchoolHouse Community Center**

#### **I. Call to order**

The regular meeting of the Redmond Park Board was called to order by Chairperson Lori Snodgrass at 7:02 p.m.

Board members present: Chair: Snodgrass, Co-chair: Kelsey, Boardmembers: Margeson, Degenstein, Callister, Stewart and Youth Advocates: Jones and Zak

Absent and Excused: Ladd

City staff present: Danny Hopkins, Director of Parks and Recreation, Timothy Cox, Parks Planning; Tom Trueblood, Parks and Recreation; Lori Peckol, Planning and Community Development; Jeff Churchill, Planning and Community Development; Kurt Seemann, Transportation Planning; and Sharon Sato, Recording Secretary.

#### **II. Approval of Minutes**

Motion for approval of the February 3, 2005 Redmond Park Board minutes as presented

Motion by: Margeson

Second by: Stewart

Motion carried: 6-0 unanimous

#### **III. Items from the Audience**

Kurt Bateman and Joel Hussey, Lake Washington Youth Soccer Association - Bateman and Hussey presented the Board and City staff a plaque thanking them for their involvement on the Perrigo Park project. He added that the Park was an outstanding facility and well utilized.

Hussey noted that there were approximately 7,000 youth member players in the Lake Washington Youth Soccer Association who often utilize City facilities. He

acknowledged the efforts of the Park Board, City Council, the Mayor and City staff for their contribution for Perrigo Park to the fields that are available to the LWYSA membership and their parents to play soccer in the City of Redmond.

**IV. Additions to the Agenda/Handouts**

Cox noted the handout listed on the agenda - Parks, Recreation and Arts Element of the Comprehensive Plan - the element is now adopted.

**V. OLD BUSINESS**

A. Park Funding Mechanism Survey - Tim Raphael, Trust for Public Lands (TPL) and Dave Metz, Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin & Associates (FMMA) - Cox introduced Raphael and Metz. Metz gave a PowerPoint presentation with the results of the survey. Metz began with some general remarks on the overall results.

- 402, City of Redmond, registered voters were surveyed
- Survey focused on three potential ballot measures - Bond, Companion Property Tax Levy and Proposed Increase in Utility Taxes.
- Utility Tax Measure - overwhelmingly against
- Bond and Tax Levy Measure - majority of voters - 60% were in favor of the bond and 64% for the Levy measure
- Threshold to pass a bond measure is 60%, with simple majority for levy
- Potential support for the measure but tentative

Specifics of methodology of survey:

- Interviewed 402 registered voters who cast ballots in the most recent election
- Interviews took place February, 8-10
- Margin of error - final numbers - +/- 4.9%

Questions:

- Do you think the City of Redmond going in the right direction?  
68% - right direction  
16% - wrong track

- Would you support a \$15 million dollar general obligation bond? This includes, money use for protect water quality - open space - natural space - wildlife habitat protection - acquire, develop and maintain neighborhood community parks, hiking, walking and biking trail.
  - 60% - approve
  - 31% - reject
  - 2-1 margin
  - 6% undecided
  - 50% firm - 31% approve, 19% reject
  - 7% need more public information
- Why voters support: (of the 60% approved) 25% good idea, 21% water quality, 19% park improvements, 12% general environmental issues, 11% preserve open space
- Why against (31% of total) - increase property taxes, raise taxes - bad idea, not enough information, City has parks, trails already, other priorities more important, trust issue with tax dollars, etc.
- What if the measure was for \$10 million instead of \$15 million, how would you vote?
  - 65% approval
  - 27% opposed
- Property tax levy to accompany the bond measure for improvements and maintenance costs (10 cents per \$1,000 assessed value)?
  - 64% approval
  - 29% opposed
- Cost for both levy and \$15 million bond measure would cost \$24 per year per \$100,000 assessed valuation, \$85 per year for average homeowner. Would you vote for both measures
  - 45% favor both
  - 25% against both
- Utility Tax - 3% increase in telephone, electrical and natural gas utilities as funding mechanism.
  - 29% approval
  - 64% oppose
  - Given \$73 per Redmond household - support increased from 29% to 34%
  - General opposition

- Voters are most enthusiastic about using funds for water quality protection (72%); protecting land around water (63%); wildlife habitat (62%) and natural open space (60%)
- Fiscal accountability mechanism make voters more inclined to support the measures

Conclusion - Redmond voters support the \$15 million bond measure, tentative - hovers around 60% approval threshold. Tax and utility tax measures low likelihood to be supported. Due to voter uncertainty voters tend to support the fiscal accountability mechanisms (audits, citizen oversights, sunset provisions). How money should be used - voters supported use for water quality protection, wildlife habitat and natural areas.

What does this mean - Fair amount of risk to put the bond forward, majority of voters in favor of both bond and tax, unclear if there is enough margin for super majority.

If the City decides to go forward, the consultant suggests the following to maximize the potential for success of the measure:

- 1) Bond measure - \$10 million level
- 2) Highlight fiscal accountability items - independent audits, citizen oversight committee, 10-year sunset provision
- 3) Focus on those areas that are high public priorities - significant amounts going to focused majority concerns
- 4) Place measures on the ballots when highest turn is possible - major state-wide elections
- 5) Broad public education program - what the needs are, what the plan is, how the money will be spent, costs
- 6) Measure - community consensus before placing measures on the ballot

Stewart asked what some of the negative feedback was from those surveyed. responded : increase taxes (Redmond residents already pay too much taxes), higher priorities money should be spent on (schools, public health, transportation), can't trust City to spend anymore of our tax dollars - typical arguments usually raised against park measures.

Ken Bechmann, Trails Commission Vice Chair - noted that water quality protection was one of the strongest issues and inquired, if asked, what specifically the City is

doing for water protection, would the City have a plan. Hopkins responded that the Board and staff would be discussing this in the future.

Celine McKeon, Redmond resident - inquired what broad education meant. Metz responded that this was a combination of making information available to the community through the City's website, community forums, newsletters/mailings discussing issues explaining what is in the measures and what impacts would have on their local community now and in past, alert them as to what the need in the community are. She also inquired if funding would be specific to the park sites and needs.

Hopkins noted that the Park Board needs to discuss further, the information from the telephone survey results and the slideshow presentation. Staff will further research whether there is enough community support for a park bond to move forward and interpret why the results came out as presented in order to formulate a potential successful strategy. Hopkins added that the key is to find out what the specific community needs are.

Snodgrass opened questions and discussion by the Board and audience. Raphael, Trust for Public Lands to respond:

- Q. Snodgrass - if the issue was placed on the ballot, when would be the earliest that would be recommended?
- A. Based on the poll results, November 2005 would not be the best opportunity for success. A higher turnout election would bring a higher success rate, bringing out the types of voters that would be more likely to raise the success rate.
- Q. Kelsey - with a communications campaign, put on by the City, would it improve the percentage above the 60%?
- A. Communications is a necessity to maintaining where the City currently is. Wide education with voters on the purposes of the funding measure going forward is important. As well as, lowering the amount of the bond amount and educating the public on the project, orienting the package toward those natural areas/water quality concepts, recreation including. Public communication will solidify those voters that are currently "probable" and influence those in support. The probable reasons for those that are opposed

to the measure: raising taxes, trust issues with public spending, or not enough information.

Q. Snodgrass - given Kirkland's recent bond success, and Bellevue's failed efforts, some of their projects were well explained, others were vague, how can that be explained?

A. Bellevue's average cost to an average household was \$84, where Kirkland's cost was \$64 per household. Impact on households in each city were significantly different. Kirkland's measure was not about specifics; values were similar in both cities. Not over reaching with the amount that will be taxed is a key consideration for obtaining 60%, super majority.

Q. Stewart - those that responded "somewhat likely" to vote for the measure, are they choosing certain items from the measures? If active recreation is part of the those major areas of interest, how likely would they oppose the measure?

A. Many of the participants were specific as to what they were most interested in seeing the funding go to; trails, water quality, environment, etc. Voters are not opposed to active recreation, just lower priority. When including it in the measure, it should be complemented with other types of spending shown to be higher priority.

Q. Margeson - in the bond language, would specify the amount of money spent for wildlife preservation, water quality, etc. improve the likelihood of more support?

A. Important for voters to see.

Q. Zak - the 5% sampling error, could mean 55% support which would seemingly make it harder to recruit more voters to approve the measure.

A. There should be a comfort margin of 5%, figuring we currently have 60% approval, for a \$15 million bond, 55% would be more realistic.

Q. Bechmann - if the list is too long it may be hard for voters to figure out what projects/programs should be part of the list or is there a way to tie down the list more specifically? Will the costs be highly visible and where will it appear?

- A. The long list of monies to be spent was divided into two groups (400 total respondents) and asked each 10 items. Projects were balanced out, covering the same areas. Recommend discussing what voters feel were highest priority, making that the focus. Does not mean that there cannot be funding within the measure for a wide variety of projects. The number/costs do not generally appear on the ballot question, it will identify the aggregate amount of the bond and rate for property tax levy, however in the supplemental materials and discussion, the figure will be aggregated.
- Q. McKeon - what numbers of voters would define a "large" voting turnout for Redmond?
- A. 70%-75% of registered voters. Lower voter turnout for local elections would be 30%-40%. The target 62+% of 30% of Redmond voters be the goal.
- Q. Kelsey - in the ballot measure itself, is it customary to be specific as to where each dollar will be spent (improvements, acquire, build parks, environment)?
- A. The ballot measure would be similar to the telephone poll language. Not elaborated on the ballot.

The Board has scheduled March 22, 7:00 p.m. as a study session to discuss the ballot measure survey.

- B. Draft Transportation Master Plan - Kurt Seemann  
Seemann invited the Park Board to engage in questions and discussion on the Draft Transportation Master Plan (TMP).
- Q. Kelsey - what is a roadway intersection project?
- A. Typically improvements to the intersection - turn way, left or right turn lane, installing a signal or something at a intersection.
- Q. Snodgrass - is the roadway functional classification illustrated on Page 5D current?

- A. This is the classification proposed by the Plan. One additional functional class type that is not on the Plan is connector streets. The other classifications are standard. All communities have similar classifications.

In the thoroughfare plan there is a listing of different arterials and how many lanes both present and future. Plans are consistent with alignments that Council adopted.

- Q. Snodgrass - is the extension of the northern portion of 166th up to 116th, proposed to be shifted over to 162nd in front of Norman Rockwell Elementary School?

- A. No

Kelsey reminded Seemann that the Park Board has written a letter in opposition to the extension and widening of Bear Creek Parkway, based upon the damage to the environment. Kelsey wanted to re-enforce the Board's comments and concerns. Kelsey added that the TMP emphasizes roadways over other forms of transportation, e.g. improving trails and bikeways., Kelsey would like to see more projects that improve the ability for people to walk and ride.

- Q. Zak - are there plans for Redmond Way and Cleveland Street to turn into two way streets? Is it in the TMP.

- A. This is part of the TMP. This will cause two-way circulation, to keep traffic flowing in and out of downtown. This was also a part of the downtown plan, focusing on the area as a place where people wanted to go.

- Q. Stewart - will NE 90th and Bear Creek Parkway become the streets around the downtown?

- A. The TMP is not an auto capacity plan. It is about providing transportation support for the key centers in Redmond. TMP focuses on better connections. The fundamental is a multi-mobile approach to transportation - better pedestrian connections, better bicycle connections, better transit connections and motorized/highway connections.

- Q. Kelsey - the downtown park and ride encourages driving downtown, there should be a park and ride east and west of the city, to provide bus transportation in and out of Redmond by-passing downtown.



- A. This plan is a good start and sends the City in a positive traffic solution direction. It is also an investment in the four modes of transportation choices, giving people choices, as they travel in and around the city. The proposal includes working with Metro on bus scheduling and routes.

Callister added that Metro's transit service routes in Redmond needed to be re-evaluated.

- Q. Jones - felt that in order to catch a bus she would have to drive a long way in order to get to a convenience bus stop. She also inquired if this was an issue that would be addressed.

- A. One of Redmond's challenges is that the bus service is operated by another entity. We continue to work with Metro Transit to work out a plan. The City does have a plan and will present it to Metro. Generally, there is more service on key corridors.

- Q. Snodgrass - is a pedestrian element being considered for the BNSF?

- A. Chapter V.A - concept of four types of pedestrian environments. Ranging from pedestrian intolerant (not pedestrian oriented), pedestrian places (gathering place for people), pedestrian tolerant (sidewalks, safe walking places), and pedestrian supportive (Level above pedestrian tolerant - feel comfortable to walk with children).

- Q. Kelsey - is the philosophy in this multi-mobile program to encourage people to get out of their cars?

- A. The philosophy is to provide people real choices.

Seemanns briefed the Board on the Bear Creek Parkway project. Staff worked with Council last year to identify the alignment for Bear Creek Parkway, currently the project is in the final selection process to select a consultant to assist in the next phase - preliminary engineering phase - to identify what to build and what the vision is. The City will work with the consultant to address issues of concern regarding the alignment.

- C. Comprehensive Plan Benchmarks Elements - Peckol and Churchill

Churchill summarized what was discussed at the January Board meeting he last attended. Churchill explained that the Comprehensive Plan was recently updated and the Benchmark Program was implemented to enable one to see to what extent Redmond is meeting the goals set forth in that Plan, it also serves as a repository of information, where people can go to find specific information about Redmond. Since January the benchmarks have been refined to reflect the comments of the Park Board and other staff from within the City.

Snodgrass commented that Planning staff had reflected the comments of the Board very well. She also noted one clarification as stated in text, "Consider measures related to parks maintenance?" Snodgrass suggested that level of service or park experience quality objectives might be of assistance to more clearly define measurement. She noted for the record that, she would hope that staff would be better able to clarify or give direction on this. Snodgrass suggested that the reference service objectives under Transportation section would be a good example.

Stewart suggested that Park Maintenance managers may have some standards or result oriented goals that could be used to identify expectations and measurements.

Peckol noted that the horizon year for the Plan is 2022. Final copy will be given to the Board when the Plan goes to the Planning Commission.

- D. GrassLawn/Rose Hill Willows Neighborhoods Facilities Evaluation - Danny Hopkins  
Staff went through a process where Board received initial information for the GrassLawn Neighborhood and Rose Hill area. The information included park properties and Strength, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) information. After staff evaluation of the GrassLawn area, staff will condense the information into a bullet list. After all City neighborhoods are evaluated the Board and staff will look at the bullet list and prioritize these into the a revised Park Improvement Plan PIP) for future use.

Preliminary information on Rose Hill/Willows Road neighborhood was provided to the Board.

## **VI. New Business**

- A. Recommendation on Suggested Changes to Park Use Fee Schedule - Trueblood

Trueblood briefed the Board on the suggested changes to the Park Use Fee Schedule. He noted that the premium turf field fees are too low and some of recreation operational costs were underestimated, e.g. monitoring field use, staff enforcement during field use, cleaning fields. A market survey was done and some modest increases are suggested. Also, rental fees for new technical equipment at the community center are proposed. Trueblood added that this increase is not intended to offset operation and maintenance costs, this increase would offset the costs of scheduling, and field monitoring.

Degenstein inquired about the advertising and filming permit, which has to do with professional photographers wanting to use park property for a photo session. Trueblood responded that this type of activity would be, based on the magnitude of production (movie productions, number of participants, etc.) and type of business, not individual, private photographers.

Kelsey had a concern about the multi-purpose rental fee and charging fees to teens for use. Trueblood responded that these fees were collected for rentals after hours, and provides for an on-site staff person.

Trueblood stated that there is a reason for an adopted fee schedule providing an avenue to charge a larger damage deposit with the backing of the fees and charges policy.

Kelsey added he did not like to see fee charged for use of Redmond facilities when taxpayers are paying for it, as a whole.

Snodgrass inquired if there was some flexibility with staff concerning those that are not able to afford rentals. Trueblood stated there was some flexibility.

Margeson asked if a staff person is available on-site at all times. Trueblood responded that not at all times, however, there is a staff person that makes the rounds to all the parks. On busy nights there might be two staff persons. The idea being to better operate facilities and in the long run reduce maintenance costs.

Trueblood stated another goal was to educate users on the proper maintenance and care of the facilities.

Stewart inquired if the fees are intended to be increased across the board for all fields, or fields with advanced turf features. Trueblood responded, fields that are premium turf fees - Perrigo Park, Hartman.

Kelsey stated he had some concerns about staff's availability to go out to the field to inspect for any damage after group use. Trueblood responded that the most reliable would be the morning after, when Park Operations crew could go out and inspect for damage. This proposal allows for a damage deposit be collected from teams.

Snodgrass inquired if the increase and the additional classification for the premium field usage would allow additional staff on the circuits? Trueblood stated that it would reduce the problems and costs of repair and damage.

This item will go to City Council for approval on April 5th and will go into effect soon after - 30 to 60 days.

Motion by: Callister to accept the revisions to the Park User Fee Schedule.  
Second: Stewart  
Approved: 6-0

**B. Capital Investment Program Funding Adjustment - Hopkins**

Hopkins noted that after the adoption of the CIP and determination of resources availability there may be modification to the CIP. During the budget process there were comments made regarding the King County Shop Site and the alignment of Bear Creek Parkway. The preferred alignment of Bear Creek Parkway has been identified going through the King County Shop site. Because this transportation facility was utilized for site acquisition, Council has discussed reimbursement of monies spent (\$1.3 million) to the Parks CIP.

If Council approves this reimbursement, the Parks Department would receive \$1.3 million. Presently, being funded: \$500,000 for GrassLawn Phase III, ORSCC \$220,000, and Hartman \$275,000. The existing funding for each of these projects include the following improvements - GrassLawn - parking lot and remove existing structure, with additional funding; with additional funds a new facility (maintenance facility downstairs and community gathering place and restrooms upstairs) can be added; ORSCC, original intent was to

renovate several classrooms into meeting room area for rentals and to help the corporate sector offset some the expenses in the building, additional monies would allow renovation of the kitchen area for banquet rentals; Hartman Park, Fields 5 & 6, light fields 5 & 6, with additional monies artificial turf would be added, multi-lined (LL fields, soccer field, Lacrosse field overlay, Women's softball field - with a Green Giant Wall on right field fence a Babe Ruth Field would be a possibility). This adjustment would add to the \$1.3 million CIP and \$900,000 remaining in 1990 Redmond Park Bond account to enhance the projects.

Motion by: Degenstein to direct staff to go forward with the proposed CIP adjustments for 2005-2006 as outlined in their memo.

Second: Margeson

Approved: 6-0

C. Watershed Preserve Gasline Maintenance - Tim Cox

Cox reported that Williams Northwest Pipeline is proposing to replace their existing 24" line with a 36" line to address capacity and safety issues, a portion of which runs through the Watershed. This issue will go before the city's Technical Advisory Committee in two weeks to review the environmental consequences and establish conditions of approval along the pipeline. The project will occur within an existing right-of-way, but may require some construction staging areas outside the easement. Construction will be somewhat disruptive to the park and remove some trees. This project has been mandated by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. Staff will come back to the Board to report on the perimeters set by the Technical Committee. The concern and goal is to return the area back to its natural state after construction and during construction the safety of Watershed Park users.

**VII. Reports - Project - Reports**

A. Lake Washington Youth Soccer @ Sammamish Valley park Site  
Re-scheduled

B. Idylwood Park Playground - Tim Cox

Preliminary design is complete. Staff will be taking this issue before the Technical Committee for the SEPA analysis in approximately two weeks. Staff is hopeful construction will begin in two months.

C. Hartman Pool - Danny Hopkins

Northwest Centers staff have generated a report that indicates the 2004 year was very successful. Significant changes have been made: increased capital dollars spent, longer hours of operations (including Sundays), increased participation by 10%. Counters have been replaced, as well as, some lighting. Northwest Centers currently operate five pools.

**VIII. Other**

A. Special Meeting

Special meeting regarding the Park Funding Mechanism:

- March 22, 2005
- Place to be announced

B. Departing Park Board Members

Snodgrass made a special presentation of certificates of appreciation to Ann Callister and David Degenstein for their 6 years of dedicated service to the City, as members of the Redmond Park Board. Snodgrass noted the expertise and unique perspectives they both brought to the Board. All Board members extended their appreciation.

**IX. Adjournment**

Motion to adjourn: Kelsey  
Second by: Degenstein  
Approved: 6-0

Meeting adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Lori Snodgrass, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Minutes prepared by Recording Secretary, Sharon Sato

Next Regular Meeting  
April 7, 2005  
7:00 p.m.

Location: Old Redmond Schoolhouse Community Center